

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

			•		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/631,273	07/31/2003	James Emanuel Amburgey JR.	2726PR	3762	
75	90 06/17/2005		EXAM	INER	
	Dr. James E. Amburgey			POPOVICS, ROBERT J	
2291 Plantation			ART UNIT	DADED MUMPED	
Lawrenceville,	GA 30044		ARTONII	PAPER NUMBER	
			1724		

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<del></del>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/631,273	AMBURGEY				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert J. Popovics	1724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replication of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to really within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a within the statutory minimum of the will apply and will expire SIX (6) MG, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed  hirty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communic  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/3	<u>1/03 (IDS)</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	·		ts is			
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraws</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-15	2.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage	•			
Attachment(s)		·				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	-	Summary (PTO-413)				
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/31/03.</li> </ol>		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1724

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claim 1,2,4 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garzonetti (US 4,693,831). See columns 1-3.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Garzonetti (US 4,693,831). Garzonetti appears to be silent with respect to the limitations set forth in claims 3 and 5-10. It is submitted that Garzonzetti inherently meets the limitations recited in claims 3 and 5-10. Alternatively, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have readily appreciated that the filter disclosed by Garzonetti could have been used to remove the specified contaminants.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garzonetti (US 4,693,831). Claim 14 differs from Garzonetti by specifying a reduction in the amount of chemicals required following backwashing. Although it is not expressly taught by Garzonetti, it would have been readily apparent to one skilled in the art, that fewer conventional treatment chemicals would be required when employing a more efficient filtration process.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert J. Popovics at telephone number (571) 272-1164.

Robert James Popovics
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724